UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/868,417	10/23/2001	Charles Cameron Lindquist	12143/1	1411

26646 7590 04/09/2009

KENYON & KENYON LLP
ONE BROADWAY
NEW YORK, NY 10004

EXAMINER	
BIAGINI, CHRISTOPHER D	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2442	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
04/09/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/868,417	LINDQUIST, CHARLES CAMERON	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Christopher Biagini	2442	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *13 February 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *59-61,63-120,123 and 124* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *59-61,63-120,123 and 124* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Remarks

This application has been assigned to a new examiner. Contact information may be found at the end of this action.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to the rejections of claims 59-61, 63-120, and 123 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph; 35 USC 102(e); and 35 USC 103(a) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Accordingly, the rejections are withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made.

Specification

The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: the specification lacks antecedent basis for the limitation "at least one communications server...determines which one of said environments said authorization data indicates authority to access" as recited in claims 59 and 124.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it

pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 59-61, 63-120, 123, and 124 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claims 59 and 124 recite the new limitation "at least one communications server...determines which one of said environments said authorization data indicates authority to access." The most relevant part of the instant application appears to be page 9, under the heading "Remote Operation." This section recites that the user first "enter[s] a URL associated with the HTML page they wish to access" (p. 9, lines 15-16), then completes a "login procedure associated with the HTML pages in question" (p. 9, line 19). Once the user is authenticated, the user is "permitted access to the HTML page requested" (p. 9, line 21). In addition, following the authentication process, "the records associated with the user, detailing connection parameters for the user premises, are retrieved from a database 18 in the provider network" (p. 9, lines 22-24). Merely retrieving records "detailing connection parameters" from database 18 is not the same as the "at least one communications server...determin[ing] which one of said environments said authorization data indicates authority to access."

Any claim not specifically addressed above is rejected at least for incorporating the deficiencies of claim 59.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 59, 64-68, 76, 78-81, 88, 89, 91-94, 102, 104, 105, 109, 110, 112-114, 117, and 123 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vaios (US Patent No. 6,271,752) in view of Malkin et al. (US Patent No. 6,061,650, hereinafter "Malkin"), and further in view of Barnier et al. (US Patent No. 6,453,348, hereinafter "Barnier").

Regarding claim 59, note that the preamble has been given patentable weight as it is relied upon by the body of the claim.

Vaios shows a system for remote access of environments (surveillance areas 4: see col. 3, lines 24-27; col. 9, lines 32-35) comprising:

- an Internet browser (remote computer system 16: see col. 4, lines 5-7);
- a network located external to said environments environment and accessible via said Internet browser (communications network 6: see col. 4, lines 30-42);
- a plurality of connection gateways, each of said environments having located therein a different one or more of said connection gateways (network interfaces 14: see Fig. 1 and col. 3, lines 24-27).

Vaios further shows controlling or monitoring operation of at least one service in said environment (see col. 7, lines 39-56, and col. 9, lines 49-61, with said connection gateway

providing access to information contained within the environment directly to said Internet browser (see col. 7, lines 39-56).

Vaios does not explicitly show:

- that the network is an extranet;
- at least one communications server located in said extranet and adapted to interconnect on-demand with said connection gateways;
- wherein responsive to accessing a predetermined address by said Internet browser on said extranet, in which accessing said Internet browser provides authorization data, one of said at least one communications server subsequently:
    - determines which one of said environments said authorization data indicates authority to access; and
    - creates a new communications session between said communications server and one of said connection gateways, which is located in said environment, with said connection gateway subsequently providing access to information contained within the environment directly to said Internet browser.

Malkin shows:

- at least one communications server located in a network and adapted to interconnect on-demand with connection gateways (Remote Access Server 22: see col. 2, lines 13-17);
- wherein responsive to accessing a predetermined address by said Internet browser on said network (comprising the RAS's telephone number: see col. 3, lines 22-

25), in which accessing said Internet browser provides authorization data (comprising a login name made up of a user name part and a domain specific part: see col. 3, lines 40-47), one of said at least one communications server subsequently:

- determines which one of said environments said authorization data indicates authority to access (comprising using the domain part of the login name to look up the address of a gateway interface and authentication server for a particular home network: see col. 3, line 48 to col. 4, line 14); and
- creates a new communications session between said communications server and one of said connection gateways (comprising a tunnel to a gateway: see col. 5, lines 35-46), which is located in said environment (see col. 5, line 65 to col. 6, line 3), with said connection gateway subsequently providing access to information contained within the environment directly to said Internet browser (see col. 6, lines 30-35).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system of Vaios with the communication server, authorization, and session establishment taught by Malkin in order to allow a user at a mobile remote node to seamlessly access his home environment (see Malkin, col. 1, lines 38-40).

Barnier shows a network comprising an extranet (see col. 2, lines 33-52). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further modify the

system of Vaios with the extranet taught by Barnier in order to establish a highly secure environment in which to provide for monitoring (see Barnier, col. 4, lines 41-53).

Regarding claim 64, the combination shows the limitations of claim 59 as applied above, and further shows wherein said communications communication server utilizes a telecommunications network to interconnect with said connection gateway (see Malkin, col. 3, lines 25-30 and Vaios, Fig. 1, network 6).

Regarding claim 65, the combination shows the limitations of claim 59 as applied above, and further shows wherein authentication to access said extranet is required only once per Internet browser session (see Malkin, col. 5, lines 47-50).

Regarding claim 66, the combination shows the limitations of claim 59 as applied above, and further shows wherein said extranet is a private network overlaid on forms part of the Internet (see Barnier, col. 1, lines 57-66)and said communications server is located within a local telephone call radius of the environment, thus providing lowest cost PSTN access from or to the environment (see Malkin, col. 3, lines 27-30).

Regarding claim 67, the combination shows the limitations of claim 59 as applied above, and further shows wherein additional interface pages accessible via said browser are provided on said extranet for each user of said system, said pages adaptable to provide details of a current

status of one of said environments which is associated with environment of said user (see Vaios, col. 7, line 63 – col. 8, line 17 and col. 9, lines 49-64).

Regarding claim 68, the combination shows the limitations of claim 59 as applied above, and further shows wherein said extranet provides a user premises e-mail facility, and automatically raises connection in a pre- programmed fashion to said connection gateway and transfers user e-mail to said connection gateway (see Barnier, col. 3, lines 62-65).

Regarding claim 76, the combination shows the limitations of claim 59 as applied above, and further shows further comprising a control terminal interconnected to said connection gateway (comprising a remote computer at end user locations 8: see Vaios, col. 4, lines 5-14).

Regarding claim 78, the combination shows the limitations of claim 76 as applied above, and further shows wherein the control terminal is connected to said connection gateway in a wireless manner (see Vaios, col. 4, lines 30-43).

Regarding claim 79, the combination shows the limitations of claim 78 as applied above, and further shows wherein the control terminal is powered by rechargeable batteries, allowing the control terminal mobility within the range of wireless transmitters attached to said environment (implicitly disclosed as a component of a beeper: see Vaios, col. 4, lines 5-14).

Regarding claim 80, the combination shows the limitations of claim 76 as applied above, and further shows wherein the control terminal is of reduced handheld size, so that it can operate as a universal premises remote control (note that it would be obvious to reduce a terminal to handheld size in order to make it more portable, see also Vaios, col. 4, lines 5-14).

Regarding claim 81, the combination shows the limitations of claim 76 as applied above, and further shows wherein the control terminal includes a digital camera, microphone and speaker, and video conferencing software, thus allowing the control terminal to be used as a videophone, through a standard browser interface (see Vaios, col. 9, lines 49-63).

Regarding claim 88, the combination shows the limitations of claim 59 as applied above, and further shows wherein said connection gateways form nodes of a distributed computing environment that may be allocated by said extranet on a demand basis (see Malkin, col. 3, lines 22-25 and note that resources are allocated upon the user's request).

Regarding claim 89, the combination shows the limitations of claim 59 as applied above, and further shows the system providing information access across at least two networks, wherein: said extranet is a first network having a first network access controller (comprising a router: see Barnier, Fig. 3); said environment is a second network having a second network access controller (comprising a router: see Vaios, col. 6, lines 54-60); said system further comprises comprising a user access browser located on said first network for locating and examining information on said first and second networks by means of network address locators

(for example, phone numbers: see Malkin, col. 3, lines 21-30); and when a predetermined location on said first network is accessed, said first network access controller initiates an establishment of a network connection to said second network access controller so as to provide for a temporary interconnection of said first network to said second network, said system thereby providing a seamless access to information stored on said second network from said user access browser (see Malkin, col. 5, lines 35-39).

Regarding claim 91, the combination shows the limitations of claim 59 as applied above, and further shows storage means forming part of said extranet (see Barnier, Fig. 3, storage 60 and col. 4, lines 53-56); and a device activating a security condition upon the occurrence of a predetermined event; wherein, upon the occurrence of said predetermined event, said device notifies said connection gateway and transfers event information on said predetermined event to said connection gateway and said connection gateway establishes an interconnection with said communications server and transfers said event information via said communications server to said storage means for later interrogation by a user of said system and initiates predetermined alert notification actions (see Vaios, col. 8, lines 56-58 and Barnier, col. 5, lines 18-23).

Regarding claim 92, the combination shows the limitations of claim 91 as applied above, and further shows wherein said device includes alert conditions which are forwarded to said connection gateway, wherein it is qualified with a pre-programmed enable, and if the result is TRUE, an event is generated, whereupon said connection gateway establishes a connection with said communications server (see Vaios, col. 8, lines 56-58 and Barnier, col. 5, lines 18-23).

Regarding claim 93, the combination shows the limitations of claim 92 as applied above, and further shows wherein said device is a security sensor device, said system is a security system, said event is a security alarm event, and said data is surveillance data or security alert data (see Vaios, col. 8, lines 36-47).

Regarding claim 94, the combination shows the limitations of claim 93 as applied above, and further shows wherein surveillance data related to said alarm event is uploaded to said extranet for secure storage accessible upon interrogation by a user (see Barnier, col. 5, lines 19-24).

Regarding claim 102, the combination shows the limitations of claim 92 as applied above, and further shows wherein user data storage on said extranet for storing event data associated with said environment is allocated virtually (see Barnier, col. 5, lines 19-24).

Regarding claim 104, the combination shows the limitations of claim 92 as applied above, and further shows wherein said extranet includes a user contact database which includes preferred contact methods, allowing automatic contact mechanisms to be associated with alarm condition, including use of e-mail, pager, computer generated voice message through telephone, requesting response, or after a specified timeout has elapsed, security action (see Vaios, col. 8, lines 59-65).

Regarding claim 105, the combination shows the limitations of claim 92 as applied above, and further shows further comprising an external access control mechanism to said environment (see Vaios, col. 9, lines 61-64).

Regarding claim 109, the combination shows the limitations of claim 59 as applied above, and further shows where said environment is a home environment (see Vaios, col. 9, line 53).

Regarding claim 110, the combination shows the limitations of claim 59 as applied above, and further shows where said environment is a commercial environment (see Vaios, col. 9, line 52-53).

Regarding claim 112, the combination shows the limitations of claim 59 as applied above, and further shows wherein the at least one service includes a security monitoring service (see Vaios, col. 9, lines 49-64).

Regarding claim 113, the combination shows the limitations of claim 59 as applied above, and further shows wherein the at least one service includes a video surveillance service (see Vaios, col. 9, lines 49-64).

Regarding claim 114, the combination shows the limitations of claim 59 as applied above, and further shows wherein the at least one service includes an automation and control service (see Vaios, col. 9, lines 49-64).

Regarding claim 117, the combination shows the limitations of claim 59 as applied above, and further shows where the a least one service implements monitoring or control of a plurality of devices connected to at least one network interconnected with connection gateway (see Vaios, col. 9, lines 32-35).

Regarding claim 123, the combination shows the limitations of claim 59 as applied above, and further shows wherein the environment is a network separate from the extranet and the connection gateway serves as an entrance from the environment to the extranet (see Vaios, Fig. 1 and col. 4, lines 30-67)

Claims 60, 61, 63, 75, 85, and 86 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vaios (US Patent No. 6,271,752) in view of Malkin (US Patent No. 6,061,650), and further in view of Barnier (US Patent No. 6,453,348) and Akatsu et al. (US Patent No. 6,496,862, hereinafter "Akatsu").

Regarding claim 60, the combination shows the limitations of claim 59 as applied above, but does not explicitly show wherein the connection gateway located in said environment is adapted to serve, in said communications session, a user interface for the control of the operation

of the at least one service in accordance with operation instructions input via said Internet browser and the monitoring of the operation of the at least one service in said environment. Akatsu shows wherein the connection gateway located in said environment is adapted to serve, in said communications session, a user interface for the control of the operation of the at least one service in accordance with operation instructions input via said Internet browser and the monitoring of the operation of the at least one service in said environment (see col. 19, lines 24-40). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further modify the system of Vaios with the teachings of Akatsu in order to reduce the burden on local computer 12.

Regarding claim 61, the combination shows the limitations of claim 60 as applied above, and further shows wherein said service includes monitoring and controlling is adapted to at least one of monitor and control, one or more devices interconnected with said connection gateway (see Akatsu, col. 19, lines 24-40 and Vaios, col. 8, lines 1-18).

Regarding claim 63, the combination shows the limitations of claim 61 as applied above, and further shows wherein at least one of said devices is a monitoring device located within said environment (see Vaios, col. 7, lines 39-61).

Regarding claim 75, the combination shows the limitations of claim 61 as applied above, and further shows wherein the connection gateway acts as a hub and Internet connection

mechanism for said interconnected connected devices including information appliances (see Akatsu, col. 19, lines 24-40).

Regarding claim 85, the combination shows the limitations of claim 75 as applied above, and further shows wherein at least one of said devices comprises a digital security camera embodying an image capture and compression method and an interconnection to said connection gateway (see Vaios, col. 9, lines 10-26).

Regarding claim 86, the combination shows the limitations of claim 85 as applied above, and further shows wherein said camera includes motion detection and image significance algorithms which run in said camera, and a filter so that only detected motion input is compressed and sent through said connection gateway to said extranet (see Vaios, col. 8, line 36 to col. 9, line 26).

Claims 69-71, 84, 107, 108, and 119 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vaios (US Patent No. 6,271,752) in view of Malkin (US Patent No. 6,061,650), and further in view of Barnier (US Patent No. 6,453,348) and Tolopka et al. (US Patent No. 6,044,349, hereinafter "Tolopka").

Regarding claim 69, the combination shows the limitations of claim 59 as applied above, but does not explicitly show wherein said Internet browser runs on an Internet access device which includes a smartcard reader and associated user smartcard which provides authentication

details and a URL corresponding to said environment. Tolopka shows a device which includes a smartcard reader and associated user smartcard which provides authentication details and a URL corresponding to an environment (see col. 2, lines 59-67 and col. 5, lines 1-13). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further modify the system of Vaios with the teachings of Tolopka in order to provide for additional security and convenience.

Regarding claim 70, the combination shows the limitations of claim 69 as applied above, and further shows wherein said smartcard also facilitates global access to the Internet for access of said extranet, and is adapted for additionally tracking connections for expenses (see Tolopka, col. 1, lines 43-46).

Regarding claim 71, the combination shows the limitations of claim 69 as applied above, and further shows wherein the Internet access device is a computer (see Vaios, col. 4, lines 5-14).

Regarding claim 84, the combination shows the limitations of claim 76 as applied above, but does not explicitly show wherein said control terminal is equipped with a smartcard reader for e-commerce transactions over said extranet. Tolopka shows wherein a terminal is equipped with a smartcard reader for e-commerce transactions over said extranet (see col. 1, lines 28-41. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further modify the system of Vaios with the teachings of Tolopka in order to provide for additional security and convenience.

Regarding claim 107, the combination shows the limitations of claim 92 as applied above, but does not explicitly show further comprising a smartcard reader that is used for user authentication. Tolopka shows a smartcard reader that is used for user authentication (see col. 3, lines 5-15). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further modify the system of Vaios with the teachings of Tolopka in order to provide for additional security and convenience.

Regarding claim 108, the combination shows the limitations of claim 107 as applied above, but does not explicitly show wherein a smartcard includes a biosensor attached to a substrate of the smartcard and interconnected with a circuit embedded in the smartcard to authenticate the user before the smartcard will operate. Tolopka shows wherein a smartcard includes a biosensor attached to a substrate of the smartcard and interconnected with a circuit embedded in the smartcard to authenticate the user before the smartcard will operate (see col. 3, lines 35-55). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further modify the system of Vaios with the teachings of Tolopka in order to provide for additional security and convenience.

Regarding claim 119, the combination shows the limitations of claim 59 as applied above, but does not explicitly show wherein the Internet browser runs on an Internet access device which includes a smartcard reader and associated user smartcard which provides authentication to access said predetermined address to create a connection to said environment.

Tolopka shows an Internet access device which includes a smartcard reader and associated user smartcard which provides authentication to access said predetermined address to create a connection to said environment (see col. 2, lines 59-67 and col. 5, lines 1-13)+. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further modify the system of Vaios with the teachings of Tolopka in order to provide for additional security and convenience.

Claim 72 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vaios (US Patent No. 6,271,752) in view of Malkin (US Patent No. 6,061,650), and further in view of Barnier (US Patent No. 6,453,348) and Woo et al. (US Patent No. 5,948,059, hereinafter "Woo").

Regarding claim 72, the combination shows the limitations of claim 59 as applied above, but does not explicitly show wherein the connection gateway detects a fax and stores the fax. Woo shows wherein a gateway detects a fax and stores the fax (see col. 4, lines 26-31). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further modify the system of Vaios with the teachings of Woo in order to provide for an additional means of data transmission.

Claim 73 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vaios (US Patent No. 6,271,752) in view of Malkin (US Patent No. 6,061,650), and further in view of Barnier (US Patent No. 6,453,348), Krehnke et al. (US Patent No. 6,014,746, hereinafter "Krehnke"), and Jones (US Patent No. 5,809,311).

Regarding claim 73, the combination shows the limitations of claim 59 as applied above, but does not explicitly show wherein the connection gateway is in a tamper proof enclosure, and operates without main power.

Krehnke shows a tamper proof enclosure (see col. 8, lines 26-40). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further modify the system of Vaios with the teachings of Krehnke in order to discourage interference from malicious individuals.

Jones shows a system which operates without main power (see col. 2, lines 23-35). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further modify the system of Vaios with the teachings of Jones in order to provide for continued operation in the event of a power failure.

Claim 74 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vaios (US Patent No. 6,271,752) in view of Malkin (US Patent No. 6,061,650), and further in view of Barnier (US Patent No. 6,453,348) and Krehnke (US Patent No. 6,014,746).

Regarding claim 74, the combination shows the limitations of claim 59 as applied above, but does not explicitly show wherein the connection gateway is tamper proof, and triggers an alarm and relays the alarm to the extranet in case of attempted tampering. Krehnke shows wherein a system is tamper proof, and triggers an alarm and relays the alarm to the extranet in case of attempted tampering (see col. 8, lines 26-40). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further modify the system of Vaios with the teachings of Krehnke in order to discourage interference from malicious individuals.

Claim 77 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vaios (US Patent No. 6,271,752) in view of Malkin (US Patent No. 6,061,650), and further in view of Barnier (US Patent No. 6,453,348) and Foster (US Patent No. 5,668,929).

Regarding claim 77, the combination shows the limitations of claim 76 as applied above, but does not explicitly show wherein the control terminal is equipped with biosensor, for access authentication of a local user in said environment to said connection gateway. Foster shows wherein a terminal is equipped with biosensor, for access authentication of a local user in said environment to said connection gateway (see col. 4, lines 56-63). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further modify the system of Vaios with the teachings of Foster in order to provide for additional security.

Claims 82 and 90 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vaios (US Patent No. 6,271,752) in view of Malkin (US Patent No. 6,061,650), and further in view of Barnier (US Patent No. 6,453,348) and Nakamura et al. (US Patent No. 6,178,413, hereinafter "Nakamura").

Regarding claim 82, the combination shows the limitations of claim 76 as applied above, but does not explicitly show wherein the control terminal includes a personal computer (PC) equipped with a user premises network connection, wherein said PC runs a browser accessing a URL corresponding to said connection gateway. Nakamura shows wherein a terminal includes a personal computer (PC) equipped with a user premises network connection, wherein said PC

runs a browser accessing a URL corresponding to a destination (col. 2, lines 1-19). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further modify the system of Vaios with the teachings of Nakamura in order comply with standard HTTP behavior.

Regarding claim 90, the combination shows the limitations of claim 89 as applied above, but does not explicitly show wherein said network address locators comprise Universal Resource Locators. Nakamura shows wherein said network address locators comprise Universal Resource Locators (col. 2, lines 1-19). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further modify the system of Vaios with the teachings of Nakamura in order to comply with standard HTTP behavior.

Claim 83 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vaios (US Patent No. 6,271,752) in view of Malkin (US Patent No. 6,061,650), and further in view of Barnier (US Patent No. 6,453,348) and Britt et al. (US Patent No. 5,940,074, hereinafter "Britt").

Regarding claim 83, the combination shows the limitations of claim 76 as applied above, but does not explicitly show wherein the control terminal is provided by a set top box connected to a television and running a web browser. Britt shows wherein a terminal is provided by a set top box connected to a television and running a web browser (see col. 4, lines 7-16). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further modify the system of Vaios with the teachings of Britt in order to provide access for users who own a television but not a computer.

Claim 87 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vaios (US Patent No. 6,271,752) in view of Malkin (US Patent No. 6,061,650), and further in view of Barnier (US Patent No. 6,453,348) and Lea et al. (US Patent No. 6,032,202, hereinafter "Lea").

Regarding claim 87, the combination shows the limitations of claim 59 as applied above, but does not explicitly show wherein said connection gateway provides support for at least one of the HomePnP, Bluetooth, HomeRF, Hiperlan and HAVi standard for network communication and appliance control. Lea shows wherein a gateway provides support for at least one of the HomePnP, Bluetooth, HomeRF, Hiperlan and HAVi standard for network communication and appliance control (see col. 6, lines 17-21). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further modify the system of Vaios with the teachings of Lea in order to support a wide variety of network protocols.

Claim 95 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vaios (US Patent No. 6,271,752) in view of Malkin (US Patent No. 6,061,650), and further in view of Barnier (US Patent No. 6,453,348) and Sadovnik et al. (US Patent No. 5,497,430, hereinafter "Sadovnik").

Regarding claim 95, the combination shows the limitations of claim 92 as applied above, but does not explicitly show wherein photos of authorized occupants of said environment are accessible from said extranet and are accessed upon said alarm event and cross referenced with said surveillance data to ascertain whether a true alarm condition has been raised. Sadovnik shows wherein photos of authorized occupants of an environment are accessible and are accessed upon said alarm event and cross referenced with said surveillance data to ascertain whether a true alarm condition has been raised (see col. 1, lines 19-40 and col. 5, lines 4-15). It would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further modify the system of Vaios with the teachings of Sadovnik in order to provide for additional security.

Claims 96-100 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vaios (US Patent No. 6,271,752) in view of Malkin (US Patent No. 6,061,650), and further in view of Barnier (US Patent No. 6,453,348) and Swartz (US Patent No. 6,445,694).

Regarding claim 96, the combination shows the limitations of claim 92 as applied above, but does not explicitly show wherein the connection gateway incorporates a user programmed phone call answer strategy, including delayed answer, and upon answering said phone call, optionally detects a voice call, in which case it records a compressed version of the voice call for later retrieval by the user, thus operating in answering machine mode. Swartz shows wherein a system incorporates a user programmed phone call answer strategy, including delayed answer, and upon answering said phone call, optionally detects a voice call, in which case it records a compressed version of the voice call for later retrieval by the user, thus operating in answering machine mode (see col. 12, lines 36-59). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further modify the system of Vaios with the teachings of Swartz in order to provide for additional communications options.

Regarding claim 97, the combination shows the limitations of claim 96 as applied above, but does not explicitly show wherein upon answering an incoming call, the connection gateway raise a connection to a communications server, and sends an indication to the user of said security system of the receipt of a recorded message. Swartz shows wherein upon answering an

incoming call, a system raises a connection to a communications server, and sends an indication to the user of said system of the receipt of a recorded message (see col. 12, lines 36-59). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further modify the system of Vaios with the teachings of Swartz in order to provide for additional communications options.

Regarding claim 98, the combination shows the limitations of claim 92 as applied above, but does not explicitly show wherein said connection gateway sends a recorded compressed voice messages to a communications server for storage on said extranet for forwarding to a user of said environment. Swartz shows wherein a system sends a recorded compressed voice messages to a communications server for storage on said extranet for forwarding to a user of said environment (see col. 12, lines 36-59). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further modify the system of Vaios with the teachings of Swartz in order to provide for additional communications options.

Regarding claim 99, the combination shows the limitations of claim 92 as applied above, and further shows wherein said environment is a home environment (see Vaios, col. 9, line 53); but does not explicitly show wherein the connection gateway provides an indication of messages received on a HTML page accessible by a user of said home environment. Swartz shows wherein a system provides an indication of messages received on a HTML page accessible by a user of an environment (see col. 12, lines 36-59). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the

art at the time of the invention to further modify the system of Vaios with the teachings of Swartz in order to provide for additional communications options.

Regarding claim 100, the combination shows the limitations of claim 92 as applied above, but does not explicitly show wherein said connection gateway is programmable to allow different response mechanisms to differing classes of alert event. Swartz shows wherein a system is programmable to allow different response mechanisms to differing classes of alert event (see col. 11, lines 1-20). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further modify the system of Vaios with the teachings of Swartz in order to provide for additional communications options.

Claim 101 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vaios (US Patent No. 6,271,752) in view of Malkin (US Patent No. 6,061,650), and further in view of Barnier (US Patent No. 6,453,348) and Coile et al. (US Patent No. 6,108,300, hereinafter "Coile").

Regarding claim 101, the combination shows the limitations of claim 92 as applied above, but does not explicitly show wherein said connection gateway contains connection details for preferred and secondary communications communication servers on said extranet, so that if a first communications communication server does not respond, other communications communication servers may be contacted until successful connection is achieved. Coile shows wherein a system contains connection details for preferred and secondary communications communication servers on said extranet, so that if a first communication server does not respond,

other communication servers may be contacted until successful connection is achieved (see col. 3, line 66 to col. 4, line 22). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further modify the system of Vaios with the teachings of Coile in order to provide for more reliability.

Claim 103 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vaios (US Patent No. 6,271,752) in view of Malkin (US Patent No. 6,061,650), and further in view of Barnier (US Patent No. 6,453,348) and Bruck et al. (US Patent No. 6,088,330, hereinafter "Bruck").

Regarding claim 103, the combination shows the limitations of claim 92 as applied above, but does not explicitly show wherein said user data storage on said extranet is allocated redundantly, ensuring integrity of stored surveillance data. Bruck shows wherein user data storage is allocated redundantly, ensuring integrity of stored surveillance data (see col. 2, lines 5-15). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further modify the system of Vaios with the teachings of Bruck in order to provide for more reliability.

Claim 106 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vaios (US Patent No. 6,271,752) in view of Malkin (US Patent No. 6,061,650), and further in view of Barnier (US Patent No. 6,453,348) and Koopman et al. (US Patent No. 5,649,014, hereinafter "Koopman").

Regarding claim 106, the combination shows the limitations of claim 92 as applied above, but does not explicitly show further comprising a reader for an RF tag embodied in keyfob or other device that is used for user authentication. Koopman shows a reader for an RF tag embodied in keyfob or other device that is used for user authentication (see col. 1, lines 16-27). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further modify the system of Vaios with the teachings of Koopman in order to provide for additional security.

Claims 111, 115, and 116 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vaios (US Patent No. 6,271,752) in view of Malkin (US Patent No. 6,061,650), and further in view of Barnier (US Patent No. 6,453,348) and Argyroudis (US Patent No. 5,892,758).

Regarding claim 111, the combination shows the limitations of claim 59 as applied above, but does not explicitly show where said environment is an industrial environment. Argyroudis shows an industrial environment (see col. 3, lines 7-20). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further modify the system of Vaios with the teachings of Argyroudis in order to provide for varied applications of the monitoring system.

Regarding claim 115, the combination shows the limitations of claim 59 as applied above, but does not explicitly show wherein the at least one service includes a utility metering service. Argyroudis shows wherein at least one service includes a utility metering service (see col. 3, lines 7-20). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to further modify the system of Vaios with the teachings of Argyroudis in order to provide for varied applications of the monitoring system.

Regarding claim 116, the combination shows the limitations of claim 59 as applied above, but does not explicitly show wherein the at least one service includes an energy management service. Argyroudis shows wherein at least one service includes an energy management service (see col. 3, lines 7-20). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further modify the system of Vaios with the teachings of Argyroudis in order to provide for varied applications of the monitoring system.

Claim 118 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vaios (US Patent No. 6,271,752) in view of Malkin (US Patent No. 6,061,650), and further in view of Barnier (US Patent No. 6,453,348) and Kikinis (US Patent No. 6,243,596).

Regarding claim 118, the combination shows the limitations of claim 59 as applied above, but does not explicitly show where the Internet browser is on a mobile phone. Kikinis shows where an Internet browser is on a mobile phone (see col. 14, lines 64-65). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further modify the system of Vaios with the teachings of Kikinis in order to reduce the number of devices mobile users need to carry.

Claim 120 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vaios (US Patent No. 6,271,752) in view of Malkin (US Patent No. 6,061,650), and further in view of

Barnier (US Patent No. 6,453,348) and Venkatraman et al. (US Patent No. 5,956,487, hereinafter "Venkatraman").

Regarding claim 120, the combination shows the limitations of claim 91 as applied above, but does not explicitly show wherein the connection gateway is embodied in a security camera. Venkatraman shows embodying network functionality in a security camera (see col. 2, lines 13-52). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further modify the system of Vaios with the teachings of Venkatraman in order to reduce the number of devices necessary to implement the system.

Claim 124 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vaios (US Patent No. 6,271,752) in view of Malkin et al. (US Patent No. 6,061,650, hereinafter "Malkin").

Regarding claim 124, note that the preamble has been given patentable weight as it is relied upon by the body of the claim.

Vaios shows a system for remote access of environments (surveillance areas 4: see col. 3, lines 24-27; col. 9, lines 32-35) comprising:

- an Internet browser (remote computer system 16: see col. 4, lines 5-7);
- a network located external to said environments environment and accessible via said Internet browser (communications network 6: see col. 4, lines 30-42);
- a plurality of connection gateways, each of said environments having located therein a different one or more of said connection gateways (network interfaces 14: see Fig. 1 and col. 3, lines 24-27).

Vaios further shows controlling or monitoring operation of at least one service in said environment (see col. 7, lines 39-56, and col. 9, lines 49-61, with said connection gateway providing access to information contained within the environment directly to said Internet browser (see col. 7, lines 39-56).

Vaios does not explicitly show:

- at least one communications server located in said network and adapted to interconnect on-demand with said connection gateways;
- wherein responsive to accessing a predetermined address by said Internet browser on said network, in which accessing said Internet browser provides authorization data, one of said at least one communications server subsequently:
    - determines which one of said environments said authorization data indicates authority to access; and
    - creates a new communications session between said communications server and one of said connection gateways, which is located in said environment, with said connection gateway subsequently providing access to information contained within the environment directly to said Internet browser.

Malkin shows:

- at least one communications server located in a network and adapted to interconnect on-demand with connection gateways (Remote Access Server 22: see col. 2, lines 13-17);

- wherein responsive to accessing a predetermined address by said Internet browser on said network (comprising the RAS's telephone number: see col. 3, lines 22-25), in which accessing said Internet browser provides authorization data (see col. 3, lines 40-47), one of said at least one communications server subsequently:
    - determines which one of said environments said authorization data indicates authority to access (comprising using the domain part of the login name to look up the address of a gateway interface and authentication server for a particular home network: see col. 3, line 48 to col. 4, line 14); and
    - creates a new communications session between said communications server and one of said connection gateways (comprising a tunnel to a gateway: see col. 5, lines 35-46), which is located in said environment (see col. 5, line 65 to col. 6, line 3), with said connection gateway subsequently providing access to information contained within the environment directly to said Internet browser (see col. 6, lines 30-35).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system of Vaios with the communication server, authorization, and session establishment taught by Malkin in order to allow a user at a mobile remote node to seamlessly access his home environment (see Malkin, col. 1, lines 38-40).

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher Biagini whose telephone number is (571) 272-9743. The examiner can normally be reached on weekdays from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell can be reached on (571) 272-3868. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Andrew Caldwell/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2442

Christopher Biagini
(571) 272-9743